UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,547	09/27/2000	Seshadri Sathyanarayan	042390.P9328	8296

		EXAMINER
7590	11/24/2003	NGUYEN, MERILYN P

Kurt P Leyendecker
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
7th Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003

/2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 September 2003_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _26-72_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _26-72_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _27 September 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.
    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Action*.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   In response to the communication dated 09/02/2003, claims 26-72 are active in this

application.

Acknowledges

2.   Receipt is acknowledged of the following items from the Applicant:

      o   The amendment has been acknowledged and made of record as Paper No. 11 and

         has been considered.

Specification

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

      o   At page 3, "summary of the invention" is missing.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4.   Claim 51 is objected to because of the following informalities: missing a --.-- at line 10.

Appropriate correction is required.

      Applicant, in his response filed 09/02/2003 (paper #11) argues that a summary of the

invention is not statutorily required, and the paragraph beginning on p. 5, line 4, fulfills the

requirements of 37 CFR 1.73. In response, the examiner contends that a summary of the

invention in the instant case is important to the understanding of the overall invention and is,

thus, required. Also, it should be separated from detail description of the invention for

clarification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis
for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United
> States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who
> has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention
> thereof by the applicant for patent.

5.   Claims 26-28, 30-35, 37-38, 40-45, 47, 49, 51-52, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

102(e) as being anticipated by Haitsuka (US 6,505,201), as set forth in the previous office action

mailed 06/18/2003 (paper #10), and reiterated herein below for convenience.

Regarding claims 26 and 37, Haitsuka discloses a method and a machine-readable

medium having stored thereon data representing instructions which, when executed by a

machine, cause the machine to perform operations comprising:

❖ monitoring computer usage of a computer user during a usage session (See Fig.

3, and col. 3, lines 14-15, and col. 6, lines 21-25);

❖ recording information (See col. 6, lines 21-23) including hypertext links selected

by the user during the monitored session (See col. 8, lines 22-36);

❖ analyzing the recorded hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session

(See col. 9, lines 38-47, and col. 6, lines 56-63); and

❖ generating a search engine query based on the determined interest (See col. 9,

lines 47-60).

Regarding claims 27 and 38, Haitsuka discloses analyzing comprises parsing hypertext

links selected by the user into words (535, Fig. 5, and col. 9, lines 38-42) and determining the

user intent based on the parsed words (46-47).

Regarding claim 28, Haitsuka discloses determining the user interest based on the content

of the hypertext links using heuristics (See col. 6, line 28 to col. 7, line 18).

Regarding claims 30 and 40, Haitsuka discloses displaying a set of words indicative of

the determined user interest (See col. 7, lines 41-54) and a button for the user to click on to

indicate a desire to receive information regarding the displayed set of words (See col. 7, lines 47-

50).

Regarding claim 31, Haitsuka discloses displaying an icon for the user to click on to start

the usage session (See col. 5, lines 53-56).

Regarding claim 32, Haitsuka discloses determining a change in the user interest by

comparing recorded information to stored category profiles (See col. 6, lines 56-63).

Regarding claim 33, Haitsuka discloses monitoring further comprises at least one of:

❖ monitoring time spent at a network site;

❖ monitoring network pages bookmarked by the user (See col. 8, lines 22-30);

❖ monitoring frequency that particular network pages are visited (See col. 6, lines
  28-37); and

❖ monitoring the content of visited network pages (See col. 8, lines 22-30), and

❖ wherein analyzing comprises analyzing the recorded information and the
  hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session (See col. 9, lines 38-47,
  and col. 6, lines 56-63).

Regarding claims 34 and 41, Haitsuka discloses generating the query is in response to a
user action and is based on the content of an item or a document currently being displayed (See
col. 6, lines 21-26).

Regarding claims 35 and 42, Haitsuka discloses generating a search engine query
comprises constructing queries to perform searches using search engines on a plurality of web
sites based on the user's interest (See col. 9, lines 52-60) and transmitting the queries to the
plurality of web sites (630, Fig. 6).

Regarding claim 43, Haitsuka discloses a profile agent for a computer system
comprising:

❖ an activity monitor (110, Fig. 3) to monitor computer usage of a computer user
  during a usage session (See Fig. 3, and col. 3, lines 14-15, and col. 6, lines 21-25),

to record information (See col. 6, lines 21-23) including hypertext links selected

by the user during the monitored session (See col. 8, lines 22-36), and to analyze

the recorded hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session (See col.

9, lines 38-47, and col. 6, lines 56-63); and

❖ a query engine (See Fig. 6) to generate a search engine query based on the

determined interest (See col. 9, lines 47-60).

Regarding claim 51, Haitsuka discloses a computer system comprising:

❖ a processor (130, Fig. 3);

❖ a network connection (120, Fig. 3);

❖ an activity monitor (110, Fig. 3) to monitor computer usage of a computer user

during a usage session (See Fig. 3, and col. 3, lines 14-15, and col. 6, lines 21-

25), to record information (See col. 6, lines 21-23) including hypertext links

selected by the user during the monitored session (See col. 8, lines 22-36), and to

analyze the recorded hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session

(See col. 9, lines 38-47, and col. 6, lines 56-63); and

❖ a query engine (See Fig. 6) to generate search engine queries to perform searches

using search engines on a plurality of Internet web sites based on the user's

interest (See col. 9, lines 47-60), and to transmit the queries to the plurality of

web sites (630, Fig. 6).

Regarding claims 44 and 52, Haitsuka discloses the activity monitor parses hypertext

links selected by the user into words (535, Fig. 5, and col. 9, lines 38-42) and determines the user

interest based on the parsed words (46-47).

Regarding claim 45, Haitsuka discloses the activity monitor determines the user's interest

based on the content of the hypertext links using heuristics (See col. 6, line 28 to col. 7, line 18).

Regarding claim 47, Haitsuka discloses the activity monitor comprises stored category

profiles and determines a shift in the user interest by comparing recorded information to stored

category profiles (See col. 6, lines 56-63).

Regarding claim 49, Haitsuka discloses the query engine constructs queries to perform

searches using search engines on a plurality of web sites based on the user's interest (See col. 9,

lines 52-60), and transmits the queries to the plurality of web sites (630, Fig. 6).

Regarding claim 54, Haitsuka discloses the activity monitor records at least one of time

spent at a network site, network pages bookmarked by the user (See col. 8, lines 22-30),

frequency that particular network pages are visited (See col. 6, lines 28-37), and the content of

visited network pages (See col. 8, lines 22-30), and the activity monitor analyzes the recorded

information and the hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session (See col. 9, lines

38-47, and col. 6, lines 56-63).

6.   Claims 56-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kravets (US

6,363,377), as set forth in the previous office action mailed 06/18/2003 (paper #10), and

reiterated herein below for convenience.

Regarding claims 56 and 63, Kravets discloses a method and a machine-readable medium

having stored thereon data representing instructions which, when executed by a machine, cause

the machine to perform operations comprising:

* ❖ transmitting a search query to a site over a network (See col. 4, lines 23-30);

* ❖ receiving a search result document from the site, the search result document

  comprising a plurality of search result entries (28, Fig. 1A, and col. 4, lines 17-22,

  Kravets et al.);

* ❖ accessing pages associated with at least some of the search result entries (See col.

  6, line 46 to col. 7, line 14);

* ❖ filtering the search result entries (See col. 7, lines 66- 67) by comparing

  information from the accessed pages to the query (See col. 7, lines 38-43); and

* ❖ selecting a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison (See col. 8,

  lines 9-16).

Regarding claim 67, Kravets discloses an apparatus comprising:

* ❖ a query engine (See Fig. 3) to transmit a search query to a site over a network

  (See col. 4, lines 23-30); and

* ❖ a results filter (See Fig. 2B) to receive a search result document from the site, the

  search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries, the results

filter further to access pages associated with at least some of the search result

entries, to filter the search result entries by comparing information from the

accessed pages to the query, and to select a subset of the search result entries

based on the comparison as addressed above in claim 56.

Regarding claim 70, Kravets discloses a computer system comprising:

- ❖ a processor (See Fig. 2B, and corresponding text);

- ❖ a network connection (See Fig. 1B);

- ❖ a query engine to transmit using the network connection search queries to search

  engines at Internet sites as addressed above in claim 67; and

- ❖ a results filter to receive search result documents over the network connection

  from the search engines, the search result documents comprising a plurality of

  search result entries, the results filter further to access pages associated with at

  least some of the search result entries, to filter the search result entries by

  comparing information from the accessed pages to the query, and to select a

  subset of the search result entries based on the comparison as addressed above in

  claim 67.

Regarding claims 57, 64, 68, and 71, Kravets discloses at least some of the information

from the accessed pages comprises hypertext links to further pages associated with the respective

search result entry (See col. 8, lines 9-16), the method further comprising parsing hypertext links

into constituent elements (See col. 5, lines 55-64), and comparing the hypertext link constituent

elements to elements of the search query (See col. 6, lines 46-63).

Regarding claims 58 and 65, Kravets discloses selecting a subset of the search result

entries comprises selecting using the comparison of information from accessed pages and the

comparison of hypertext link constituent elements (See col. 7, line 44 to col. 8, line 29).

Regarding claims 59, 66, 69, and 72, Kravets discloses at least some of the search result

entries include a description of an associated document (See col. 8, lines 18-21), the method

further comprising parsing at least a portion of the descriptions into constituent elements (See

col. 5, lines 55-64)[1], and comparing the description constituent elements to elements of the

search query (See col. 8, lines 21-25) and wherein selecting a subset comprises selecting a subset

using the description constituent elements comparison (See col. 8, lines 27-29).

Regarding claim 60, Kravets discloses generating a summary document comprised of the

'selected subset of the search result entries, and displaying the summary document (See col. 8,

lines 27-29).

Regarding claim 61, Kravets discloses the network comprises the Internet (See col. 4,

line 32), and the site comprises a search engine at a remote World Wide Web site (See col. 4,

line 32).

Regarding claim 62, Kravets discloses the network comprises the Internet (See col. 4, line 32), the method further comprising transmitting the search query to a plurality of search engines at remote World Wide Web sites (See col. 4, lines 23-30) and receiving a plurality of search result documents from the search engines, each search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries (28, Fig. 1A, and col. 4, lines 17-22, Kravets et al.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 29, 39, 46, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haitsuka (US 6,505,201), in view of Ryan (US 6,421,675), as set forth in the previous office action mailed 06/18/2003 (paper #10), and reiterated herein below for convenience.

Regarding claims 29, 39, 46, and 53, Haitsuka discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in claim 26; however, Haitsuka is silent as to analyzing comprises applying the hypertext links to keyword tables, the keyword tables comprising words that are indicative of user interest. On the other hand, Ryan discloses analyzing comprises applying the hypertext links to keyword tables (See col. 12, lines 16-60, Ryan et al.). Because Haitsuka

---

[1] Please note that hypertext link itself broadly describe the associated document, therefore parsing the hypertext

system uses information on hypertext links to determine user interest, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to applying the

hypertext links to keywords tables as suggested by Ryan, since applying the hypertext links to

keywords tables clarifies user interest by showing links between information supplies and

information request (See col. 12, lines 20-22, Ryan et al.).

8.   Claims 36, 48, 50, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Haitsuka (US 6,505,201), in view of Kravets (US 6,363,377), as set forth in the previous

office action mailed 06/18/2003 (paper #10), and reiterated herein below for convenience.

Regarding claims 36, 48, 50, and 55, Haitsuka discloses all the claimed subject matter as

set forth above in claim 35, however, Haitsuka is silent as to receiving search result documents

from the web sites, the search result documents comprising a plurality of search result entries,

filtering the search result entries based on the determined interest, and selecting a subset of the

search result entries based on the filtering. On the other hand, Kravets discloses receiving search

result documents from the web sites, the search result documents comprising a plurality of search

result entries (28, Fig. 1A, and col. 4, lines 17-22, Kravets et al.), filtering the search result

entries based on the determined intent (See col. 8, lines 9-16, Kravets et al.), and selecting a

subset of the search result entries based on the filtering (See col. 8, lines 15-16, Kravets et al.).

Because Haitsuka system generate a search engine query, it would have been obvious to one

links also the same as parsing descriptions.

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receiving, filtering, and

selecting a subset of the search results as suggested by Kravet, in term of relevant search results.

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments filed on 09/02/2003 about the claim rejection of the last Office

Action have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Haitsuka fails to suggest the claimed recitation of generating a

search engine query based on the determined interest. The examiner respectfully point out that

Haitsuka does suggest generating a search engine query based on the determined interest by

applying the determined interest information analyzed by the monitoring system on targeting

advertising to the user (See col. 9, lines 45-50). In order to use the monitored information for

targeting advertising to the user, the system thus generating a query based on the determined

interest so that the relevant and targeted data would be sent to the right users (See col. 7, lines 5-

17).

Applicant argues that Kravets fails to suggest any kind of filtering the search result

entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the query. The examiner

respectfully disagrees. The search result entries (col. 4, lines 17-22) of Kravets are partitioned

into clusters (col. 5, lines 42-53). In order to group search result entries, the system accesses to

pages of documents to classify similar documents into result clusters (See col. 6, line 46 to col. 7,

line 14). Result clusters contain all the documents of interest so that user can indicate the

relevancy of a cluster to his informational needs, thus comparing to his query for filtering the

undesired documents (col. 7, line 44 to col. 8, line 29).

Conclusion

10.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5177.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular

communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Mn
MN
November 14, 2003

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100